

Appl. No. : 09/847,208
Filed : May 1, 2001

--40. (Once Amended) The fusion molecule of claim 3 wherein said first polypeptide sequence comprises a sequence encoded by nucleic acid hybridizing under stringent conditions to the complement of the hinge-CH₂-CH₃ coding sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1, wherein said first polypeptide sequence is capable of specific binding to a native human Fc_yRIIb receptor, and wherein said stringent conditions comprise hybridization in 50% formamide, 6X SSC (0.75 M NaCl, 0.075 M sodium citrate), 50 mM sodium phosphate (pH 6.8), 0.1% sodium pyrophosphate, 5X Denhardt's solution, sonicated salmon sperm DNA (100 µg/ml), 0.5% SDS, and 10% dextran sulfate at 42 °C, with washes at 42 °C in 2X SSC and 0.1% SDS at 55 °C, followed by a high-stringency wash comprising 0.2X SSC comprising 0.1% SDS at 42 °C.

C15
41. (Once Amended) The fusion molecule of claim 3 wherein said second polypeptide sequence comprises a sequence encoded by nucleic acid hybridizing under stringent conditions to the complement of the CH₂-CH₃-CH₄ coding sequence of SEQ ID NO: 4, wherein said second polypeptide sequence is capable of specific binding to a native human FcεRI receptor, and wherein said stringent conditions comprise hybridization in 50% formamide, 6X SSC (0.75 M NaCl, 0.075 M sodium citrate), 50 mM sodium phosphate (pH 6.8), 0.1% sodium pyrophosphate, 5X Denhardt's solution, sonicated salmon sperm DNA (100 µg/ml), 0.5% SDS, and 10% dextran sulfate at 42 °C, with washes at 42 °C in 2X SSC and 0.1% SDS at 55 °C, followed by a high-stringency wash comprising 0.2X SSC comprising 0.1% SDS at 42 °C.--

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action dated October 10, 2001, the Examiner has reconsidered the previous Restriction Requirement, and has expanded the number of claims to be examined in the elected group (*i.e.*, Group V). Thus, in view of the Examiner's reconsideration, as well as the Applicant's prior Amendment dated July 27, 2001, Claims 1-6, 22-27, 29-30, 40-54 and 73-76 are currently pending in the present Application. These pending claims stand rejected for allegedly lacking enablement and written description (35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph), for the alleged insertion of new matter in the claims and specification (35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph), for alleged indefiniteness (35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph), and for alleged obviousness (35 U.S.C. § 103(a)).

It is noted that in the Amendment and Response dated July 27, 2001, Applicants inadvertently cancelled Claim 54 in a clerical error. Applicants did not intend to cancel Claim